

Strategic Water Supply Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #4
Minutes
January 10, 2013
Multi-Purpose Room
12:00 Noon

Attendance:

Ad Hoc Committee Members: Amanda Nairn, Curtis McCarty, David Sabatini, Jim Gasaway, Judith Wilkins, Matthew Leal, Mike Pullin, Roger Frech, Sandy Bahan, Stephen Tyler Holman

Councilmembers: Mayor Rosenthal, Roger Gallagher

Public: Joy Hampton, Jay Cervi, Richard McKown

Staff: John Rehring, Amber Wooten, Ken Komiske, Mark Daniels, Chris Mattingly, Charlie Thomas, Gay Webb

Introduction and Goals for Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Mr. Komiske welcomed committee members to the meeting. He announced that Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District (COMCD) has imposed a 10% reduction in the amount of water that Norman can get from Lake Thunderbird. A proclamation declaring Phase 2 Mandatory Water Conservation effective January 14, 2013 will be published in the Transcript on Sunday.

A comment was made that Phase 3 Water Conservation allows hand watering anytime but should be restricted to cooler time of day. Mr. Komiske stated staff will be reviewing the current Water Conservation Plan with Council; any changes to the plan will require Council approval.

The goal of the meeting today is to provide an update on water supply options, discuss the list of initial supply portfolios, and get Committee members' feedback on when to schedule the next public meeting to best get meaningful input.

Selection of Ad Hoc Committee Chair

Mr. Komiske asked if the Committee would like to elect a Chairperson to serve as a spokesperson for the group; the Committee concluded that no Chair is needed.

Update On Water Supply Options

Mr. Komiske introduced John Rehring, Carollo Project Manager and Amber Wooten, Carollo Project Engineer. Mr. Rehring reviewed the water supply planning process and

updated the Committee on the recently completed Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District (COMCD) Study on Lake Thunderbird Augmentation. COMCD found that augmenting Lake Thunderbird with treated wastewater effluent is the best option. For the Strategic Water Supply Plan (SWSP) options, the COMCD study option for 15 million gallons day (mgd) augmentation from Norman's wastewater treatment plant was selected as the basis of analysis, since it is more directly in Norman's control (vs. augmenting the lake with effluent from Moore and Norman), and since Moore's participation is uncertain. There are significant permitting uncertainties and challenges with this sensitive water supply.

Mr. Rehring discussed indirect potable reuse options, which include groundwater recharge and Lake Thunderbird Augmentation with augmentation appearing to be the better option, as it is less costly (in terms of unit capital costs) and more likely to be implemented in the time needed. Direct potable reuse (landscape irrigation and commercial/industrial uses) will also be considered in the portfolios. Ms. Wooten explained cost estimate calculations.

Review Initial List of Water Supply Portfolios

Mr. Rehring described existing water supply sources and the Garber-Wellington treatment options for chromium 6 and arsenic. The six "bookend" portfolios to be evaluated based on the weighted criteria ranked by members include:

- Portfolio 1: Maximize Local Source Use
- Portfolio 2: Low Capital Cost
- Portfolio 3: 100% from Oklahoma City Treated
- Portfolio 4: 100% from Oklahoma City Raw
- Portfolio 5: 100% from New Out of Basin Reservoir
- Portfolio 6: 100% from Kaw Reservoir

After the detailed evaluations are complete, four hybrid portfolios will be created. They will likely be a combination of strongest regional and local sources. From the four hybrid portfolios, approximately two portfolios with the best water supply options will be chosen to carry forward in the process.

Questions Asked

- What is the major groundwater recharge cost? Mr. Rehring responded treatment and infrastructure costs to reach augmentation point.
- What about public perception of Lake Thunderbird augmentation? Public acceptance would need to be addressed with either Lake Thunderbird indirect public reuse or groundwater recharge.

- Roger Frech noted the COMCD is very concerned with maintaining water quality. Water put into the lake must not degrade existing lake's water quality.
- Question asked about what costs were included in the reuse options estimated unit capital costs. Ms. Wooten explained they include both piping and treatment that would occur on the wastewater effluent and on water treatment before distribution. Operating and life cycle costs will be considered during portfolio analyses.
- Request that potential for arsenic remobilization in groundwater recharge and recovery operations be explained further. Mr. Rehring explained in other places where they have implemented groundwater recharge and recovery, due to differences in water chemistry between aquifer water and the water being recharged, there have been some elevated levels of arsenic in the water when withdrawn due to remobilization of arsenic in the aquifer. We do not know enough now to say whether this would be an issue in the Garber Wellington aquifer.
- How many existing wells, inactive wells and what are we allowed to take out of Lake Thunderbird? Staff responded we have 36 operational wells (9 mgd), 12 inactive wells and an allocation of 8.3 mgd (average) from Lake Thunderbird.
- Don't we anticipate fewer options to drill more wells when they are back up for renewal? Mr. Rehring stated preliminary results from Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB) indicate equal proportionate shares cutback by 1.5 AFY/AC to 0.5 AFY/AC but reduced permit rate should not be limiting factor on new wells, given the amount of land Norman could dedicate to well permits.
- When does contract renew to take out of Lake Thunderbird? Contract does not renew; allocations are set permanently unless COMCD votes to change allocation percentages.
- Comment made that Cleveland County Rural Water District is planning to drill 2 or 3 wells – would this impact Norman's well supply (or aquifer levels)? Mr. Rehring responded it depends on proximity, but likely their wells would not impact Norman.
- Do we have funds budgeted to drill new wells? Staff responded that there is no funding for new wells in the budget. The last rate increase had funding for new wells and the City has completed those. New future wells likely would require rate increase.
- Overall holding capacity of the lake has decreased by how much due to sedimentation? Mr. Rehring responded the Lake Thunderbird firm yield has

allocated storage capacity to account for 100 years of silt accumulation. Current allocation does not need to be decreased to account for sedimentation.

- Mr. Mattingly noted that staff worries if we just continue to drill more wells, these funds may be wasted if the regulations change requiring treatment of all groundwater.
- Will Operation and Maintenance costs be evaluated in the final portfolio review? Mr. Rehring replied yes.
- Question asked for more information on additional conservation. Mr. Rehring responded for the SWSP, we are building on what is in Norman's current conservation plan including public education, reducing non-revenue water, conservation rates, etc.

Action Items and Next Steps

Mr. Rehring asked when the Committee thought would be the best time to hold Public Meeting #3: now and then evaluate the six preliminary portfolios and develop hybrid portfolios or go ahead and evaluate the six preliminary portfolios and develop hybrid portfolios and provide that information at Public Meeting #3. The Committee agreed to have the evaluation information available at Public Meeting #3. It will take approximately a month to evaluate the portfolios and then Public Meeting #3 will be scheduled.

Mr. Rehring and Mr. Komiske thanked the committee members for attending. The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Items submitted for the record:

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, Norman Utilities Authority 2060 Strategic Water Supply Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting, January 10, 2013.